

KIAS-P99008
hep-th/9901152
January 1999

Eleven-dimensional massless superparticles and matrix theory spin-orbit couplings revisited

Seungjoon Hyun¹, Youngjai Kiem², and Hyeonjoon Shin³

School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 130-012, Korea

Abstract

The classical probe dynamics of the eleven-dimensional massless superparticles in the background geometry produced by N source M -momenta is investigated in the framework of N -sector DLCQ supergravity. We expand the probe action up to the two fermion terms and find that the fermionic contributions are the spin-orbit couplings, which precisely agree with the matrix theory calculations. We comment on the lack of non-perturbative corrections in the one-loop matrix quantum mechanics effective action and its compatibility with the supergravity analysis.

¹hyun@kias.re.kr

²ykiem@kias.re.kr

³hshin@kias.re.kr

The $SU(N)$ matrix quantum mechanics, also called matrix theory, is believed to provide the quantum description of the eleven-dimensional supergravity in the $N \rightarrow \infty$ limit [1]. In the framework of the discrete light-cone quantization (DLCQ), the correspondence between the matrix quantum mechanics and the eleven-dimensional supergravity is conjectured to elevate to the case of the finite N and finite eleventh circle size R [2]. Upon taking the large N limit while keeping the ratio $p_- = N/R$ fixed, the same limit as the one in the case of the infinite momentum frame formulation of Ref. [1] can be attained from the DLCQ framework, according to the argument of Ref. [2]. Within the DLCQ framework, the precise agreement between the matrix quantum mechanics and the classical eleven-dimensional massless particle probe dynamics, corresponding to two-body M -momentum scatterings, was demonstrated in Ref. [3]⁴. Specifically the bosonic one-loop F^4 term computed from the matrix quantum mechanics turns out to be identical to the classical bosonic action v^4 term for the massless particles moving along the M theory circle [3].

The matrix quantum mechanics has sixteen supercharges. Therefore, the existence of the one-loop bosonic F^4 term in the effective action implies the existence of the terms with higher (even) fermion numbers, up to eight fermion terms [6, 7]. Within the matrix quantum mechanics, by perturbative analysis, two fermion terms [8], four fermion terms [9] and eight fermion terms [10] were explicitly calculated. The general structure and explicit form of the fermion terms were also analyzed from the ten-dimensional IIA string theory approach [6, 8, 11] and from the eleven-dimensional supergravity perspective [5]. A key issue to consider when approaching the problem from the type IIA side analysis (being the small R analysis) is whether taking the large N (thereby large R) limit will induce substantial non-perturbative corrections. In the case of the D2-brane scatterings described by the (2+1)-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory, for example, there are indeed big instanton corrections in the large R limit [12, 13, 14, 15]. A surprising answer, at least from the matrix quantum mechanics point of view, is that there are no non-perturbative corrections as shown by the non-renormalization theorem of Sethi, Stern

⁴In Ref. [4], an LSZ formalism for the scattering problems in the context of the eleven-dimensional M theory was developed. Recently, the general two-body scattering perturbative dynamics in M theory was systematically analyzed in Ref. [5] up to four fermion terms. We note that, up to four fermion terms, the spin effects are the spin-orbit coupling type.

and Paban [16]. Thus, the fermion terms computed from both the IIA theory side and the perturbative matrix quantum mechanics side, without any further corrections, should match the classical, eleven-dimensional M -momentum scattering dynamics, including all (up to eight) fermion terms, if the matrix quantum mechanics is to describe the complete eleven-dimensional supergravity as conjectured.

Given these developments, there are at least two issues that require better understanding. First, we need manifestly eleven-dimensional *and* supersymmetric description of the classical M momentum dynamics, which does not rely on the assumption of small R . This does not only give us a framework that is valid for the large R limit, but also yields a substantial technical benefit of the straightforward implementation of the DLCQ prescription, which is easy to implement in the eleven dimensional set-up [17, 18, 19]. For example, in the analysis of Refs. [6] and [7], it is unclear how to implement the DLCQ prescription and how to incorporate the large R , strong coupling effects for the fermion terms. Second, the spin effects for the probe M -momentum should be incorporated. In the case of Ref. [8], the rotation effect resulting from the spinning source D-particles, represented by the off-diagonal elements of the background metric in a standard fashion, was shown to account for the two fermion spin-orbit coupling terms of the matrix quantum mechanics, while the probe D-particle was assumed to be spinless. Considering the two-body nature of the source-probe dynamics, it will not make a lot of difference whether we assign spins to source D-particles or to probe D-particles, especially as far as spin-orbit couplings are concerned. However, the matrix theory predicts the existence of the eight fermion terms [10], and it turns out that the eight fermion interaction is of the spin-spin type; we clearly need to consider both spinning source and spinning probe D-particles (or M -momenta) at the classical level. It is unclear how to incorporate the effects of the spinning probes along the line of the supergravity side calculation of Ref. [8]. To reproduce eight fermion terms from the eleven-dimensional supergravity analysis, as suggested by the membrane static potential calculations of Ref. [20], we need to consider the couplings between the background gravitino field, produced by the spinning source M -momenta, and the spin fermion fields of the probe M -momenta. Thus, the inclusion of the spin fermions for the probe M -momenta is essential.

In this paper, we positively solve the two issues raised in the above. We consider the superspace formulation of the spinning massless superparticle action in the presence of the eleven-dimensional background geometry. By rewriting the superspace fields in terms of the component fields up to two fermion terms (the fermion field here represents the spin of the probe particle), we show that the eleven-dimensional, classical, massless superparticle probe action expanded up to two fermion terms, in the presence of the spinless source M -momenta, becomes the form of the matrix quantum mechanics effective action up to one-loop and two fermion terms. We then choose an appropriate harmonic function, forced upon us by the DLCQ prescription, to describe the bosonic background geometry produced by source M -momenta. We find that the two actions precisely agree under this choice. Our set-up for the classical supergravity calculations is eleven-dimensional and is able to account for the probe spin effects.

Our $SO(1, 10)$ spinor conventions are as follows. The eleven-dimensional 32×32 gamma matrices Γ^r ($r = 0, 1, \dots, 9, 11$) that we use in this paper are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^0 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I_{16} \\ -I_{16} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Gamma^i = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \gamma^i \\ \gamma^i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \Gamma^{11} &= \Gamma^0 \dots \Gamma^9 = \begin{pmatrix} I_{16} & 0 \\ 0 & -I_{16} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where I_{16} is the 16×16 identity matrix and γ^i are real 16×16 $SO(9)$ gamma matrices ($i = 1, \dots, 9$). Our signature choice for the metric is $(- + \dots +)$ and the gamma matrices satisfy $(\Gamma^0)^\dagger = -\Gamma^0$ and $(\Gamma^i)^\dagger = \Gamma^i$. Therefore, for the eleven-dimensional Majorana spinors χ and θ , we have $\bar{\theta}\chi = \bar{\chi}\theta$ and $\bar{\theta}\Gamma^{r_1 \dots r_k}\chi = (-1)^{k(k+1)/2}\bar{\chi}\Gamma^{r_1 \dots r_k}\theta$. Here $\Gamma^{r_1 \dots r_k}$ is the totally anti-symmetrized k -product with the normalization factor $k!$.

We start from the description of the background geometry of the N -sector DLCQ supergravity. The eleven-dimensional metric is given by⁵ [17] [19]

$$ds_{11}^2 = dx^+ dx^- + h(r) dx^{-2} + dx_1^2 + \dots + dx_9^2, \quad (2)$$

where

$$h(r) = \frac{15}{2} \sum_{I=1}^N \frac{1}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_I|^7} \quad (3)$$

⁵For the units chosen in this paper, we follow the notation of Ref. [3] combined with the choice $2\pi\alpha' = 1$, which implies $RM_p^3 = 1$. We further set $M_p = R = 1$ for simplicity, which implies $T_0 = 1$ in Ref. [8].

is the harmonic function of the Laplacian of the transversal nine-dimensional space-time. Here $\vec{r}$ denotes a nine-dimensional position $\vec{r} = (x_1, \dots, x_9)$. The asymptotically light-like coordinate $\tau = x^+/2$ plays the role of the time-coordinate and x^- is compactified via the identification $x^- \simeq x^- + 2\pi$ [17]. Until the stage where we compare our supergravity results to the matrix theory results, we will not make any specific assumption about the form of the function $h(r)$ shown in Eq. (3). In terms of (t, x^{11}) coordinates defined by $x^\pm = x^{11} \pm t$, the metric Eq. (2) can be rewritten as

$$ds_{11}^2 = -f^{-1}dt^2 + f(dx^{11} - \frac{f-1}{f}dt)^2 + dx_1^2 + \dots + dx_9^2, \quad (4)$$

where $f = 1 + h$. For the metric of the form Eq. (4), the non-vanishing spin connections are

$$\begin{aligned} \omega^0_i = \omega^i_0 = \omega^{11}_i = -\omega^i_{11} &= -\frac{1}{2}f^{-1/2}\partial_i f(dx^{11} - dt) = -\frac{1}{2}f^{-1/2}\partial_i f dx^- \\ \omega^0_{11} = \omega^{11}_0 &= -\frac{1}{2}f^{-1}\partial_i f dx^i, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $i = 1, \dots, 9$. The background geometry described by the metric Eq. (4) admits sixteen Killing spinors that satisfy the Killing spinor equation

$$D_\mu \eta = (\partial_\mu - \frac{1}{4}\omega_\mu^{rs}\Gamma_{rs})\eta = 0, \quad (6)$$

consistent with the existence of the sixteen unbroken supersymmetries. We use $(\mu, \nu, \rho, \dots)$ indices for the curved space bosonic coordinates, and the tangent space bosonic indices are represented as $(r, s, t, \dots)$. Since the function f depends only on the transversal coordinates $(x_1, \dots, x_9)$, we can set the covariantly constant spinor η as $\eta = f_\eta \epsilon_{(32)}$ where f_η is a function of the transversal coordinates and $\epsilon_{(32)}$ is a constant 32-component Majorana spinor. The $\mu = 0$ and $\mu = 11$ components of Eq. (6) implies that

$$(\Gamma_0 + \Gamma_{11})\epsilon_{(32)} = 0 \rightarrow \Gamma_{011}\epsilon_{(32)} = \epsilon_{(32)}, \quad (7)$$

while the $\mu = i$ component gives

$$(\partial_i + \frac{1}{4}f^{-1}\partial_i f \Gamma_{011})f_\eta \epsilon_{(32)} = 0. \quad (8)$$

Noting that Eq. (7) implies that $\Gamma_{011}\epsilon = \epsilon$, we can solve Eq. (8) immediately to get

$$\eta = f^{-1/4}\epsilon_{(32)}, \quad \epsilon_{(32)} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_{(16)} \\ \epsilon_{(16)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

where we use the representation of the gamma matrices that we introduced in (1), and $\epsilon_{(16)}$ is a sixteen component $SO(9)$ spinor.

In the superspace formulation in terms of the superspace coordinates

$$Z^M(\lambda) = (x^\mu(\lambda), \theta^\alpha(\lambda))$$

as functions of the world-line time coordinate λ , the manifestly space-time supersymmetric particle action can be written down as follows:

$$S = \int d\lambda \mathcal{L} = -m \int d\lambda (-\eta_{rs} \Pi^r \Pi^s)^{1/2} \equiv -m \int d\lambda (-g(Z))^{1/2}. \quad (10)$$

The pull-back⁶ Π^A of the supervielbein⁷ E_M^A to the particle's world-line satisfies $\Pi^A = (dZ^M/d\lambda) E_M^A$. The metric η_{rs} is the Lorentz invariant constant metric and m denotes the particle mass, for which we will take $m \rightarrow 0$ limit. When taking this limit, since the background fields do not have any explicit dependence on x^- , we keep the momentum

$$p_- = \frac{\delta S}{\delta \dot{x}^-} = \frac{m}{(-g(Z))^{1/2}} \eta_{rs} \Pi^r \frac{\partial \Pi^s}{\partial \dot{x}^-} = \text{fixed}, \quad (11)$$

where the overdot represents the derivative with respect to λ . This implies that as $m \rightarrow 0$, we have to require $g(Z) = 0$. Just as in Ref. [3], we then have to compute the Routhian

$$\mathcal{L}' = \mathcal{L} - p_- \dot{x}^- (p_-), \quad (12)$$

which reduces to

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{L}' = -p_- \dot{x}^-, \quad (13)$$

in the massless limit. We have to solve $\dot{x}^-$ from the condition $g(Z) = 0$ and plug it into Eq. (13) to compute the action. For this purpose, we set

$$\Pi^r = \dot{x}^- A_-^r + B^r, \quad (14)$$

and the condition $g(Z) = 0$ can be solved for $\dot{x}^-$ in terms of A_-^r and B as

$$\dot{x}^- = \frac{\sqrt{(\eta_{rs} A_-^r B^s)^2 - (\eta_{rs} A_-^r A_-^s)(\eta_{tu} B^t B^u)} - (\eta_{rs} A_-^r B^s)}{\eta_{rs} A_-^r A_-^s} \quad (15)$$

⁶The indices $(A, B, C, \dots)$ collectively denote the bosonic and fermionic tangent space indices.

⁷We use $(M, N, P, \dots)$ to collectively denote the bosonic and fermionic curved space indices.

To write down an explicit action for the spin-orbit couplings in a given background geometry, we have to expand the action, Eq. (13), to the quadratic terms in the eleven-dimensional Majorana spinor variable θ , which represents the probe M -momentum spin. We can derive the following covariant expression for the superfields in terms of the component fields up to the quadratic terms in the fermionic variable θ ;

$$\Pi^r = \dot{x}^\mu (e_\mu^r - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\theta} \Gamma^{rst} \theta \omega_{\mu st}) + \bar{\theta} \Gamma^r \dot{\theta} + \dots, \quad (16)$$

which is valid when the background gravitino field and the tensor gauge fields are zero, corresponding to the spinless background geometry of Eq. (2). Here e_μ^r 's are the bosonic elfbeins of the background geometry. The derivation of Eq. (16) closely parallels the similar calculations in the case of the supermembranes in Ref. [21], and relies on the simplifying feature that the background fields are all on-shell, satisfying the classical equations of motion. Unlike the case of the ten-dimensional D-particles where the super-generalization is difficult due to the existence of the RR one-form gauge field, in the eleven-dimensional context starting from the action (10), the long range fields that mediate interactions are all gravitational metric fields. Using Eq. (16), we can compute A_-^r and B^r as

$$A_-^r = e_-^r - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\theta} \Gamma^{rst} \theta \omega_{-st}, \quad (17)$$

$$B^r = \dot{x}^+ (e_+^r - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\theta} \Gamma^{rst} \theta \omega_{+st}) + \dot{x}^i (e_i^r - \frac{1}{4} \bar{\theta} \Gamma^{rst} \theta \omega_{ist}) + \bar{\theta} \Gamma^r \dot{\theta}, \quad (18)$$

up to the quadratic order terms in θ . The massless superparticle action possesses local fermionic κ -symmetry, which in our context can be straightforwardly verified in the einbein formulation. Under the background choice of Eq. (2), we impose the following κ -projection condition for the spinor θ

$$(\Gamma^0 + \Gamma^{11})\theta = 0 \rightarrow \Gamma^{011}\theta = \theta \rightarrow \theta = \begin{pmatrix} \theta_{(16)} \\ -\theta_{(16)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

that results from the κ -symmetry gauge fixing. Here, $\theta_{(16)}$ is a sixteen component $SO(9)$ spinor. The Killing spinors η corresponding to the unbroken supersymmetry generators satisfy $\Gamma^{011}\eta = -\eta$ from the Killing spinor equation (7). On the other hand, the broken supersymmetry generators satisfy the same condition as the projection condition imposed

in Eq. (19). In terms of the $\Gamma^\pm = \Gamma^{11} \pm \Gamma^0$ that satisfy $(\Gamma^+)^2 = (\Gamma^-)^2 = 0$ and $(\Gamma^\pm)^\dagger = \Gamma^\mp$, the projection condition Eq.(19) can be expressed as

$$\Gamma^+ \theta = 0, \quad (20)$$

which implies $\theta^T \Gamma^- = 0$. Thus, the Dirac conjugate $\bar{\theta} \equiv i\theta^T \Gamma^0$ can be written as

$$\bar{\theta} = i\theta^T \frac{1}{2}(\Gamma^+ - \Gamma^-) = i\theta^T \Gamma^\tau, \quad (21)$$

where $\Gamma^\tau = \Gamma^+/2$. This computation is consistent with our previous choice of the $\tau = x^+/2$ as a time-coordinate.

We choose the static gauge $\dot{x}^\tau = 1$ and we set $\dot{x}^i = v^i$. We then use the Majorana properties of θ , the non-vanishing components of the spin connections shown in Eq. (5), and Eqs. (17), (18), (19), to explicitly compute

$$\eta_{rs} A_-^r A_-^s = h + O(\theta_{(16)}^4) + \dots, \quad (22)$$

$$\eta_{rs} A_-^r B^s = 1 + 2ihf^{-1/2}\theta_{(16)}^T \dot{\theta}_{(16)} + if^{-1/2}v_i \partial_j h \theta_{(16)}^T \gamma^{ij} \theta_{(16)} + \dots, \quad (23)$$

$$\eta_{rs} B^r B^s = v^2 + 8if^{-1/2}\theta_{(16)}^T \dot{\theta}_{(16)} + \dots, \quad (24)$$

up to the quadratic order terms in θ in an arbitrary BPS background geometry of the type shown in Eq. (2). Furthermore, for the small velocity expansion, we assign an ordering $O(v^i) = 1$, $O(\theta) = 1/2$ and $O(d/d\lambda) = 1$. Plugging Eqs. (22), (23) and (24) into the action (13) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}' = p_- \Big[& \frac{1}{2}v^2 + 4if^{-1/2}\theta_{(16)}^T \dot{\theta}_{(16)} \\ & + \frac{1}{8}h(v^2)^2 - \frac{i}{2}v^2 f^{-1/2}v_i \partial_j h \theta_{(16)}^T \gamma^{ij} \theta_{(16)} + iv^2 f^{-1/2}h \theta_{(16)}^T \dot{\theta}_{(16)} + \dots \Big], \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we retained terms of order up to four. Since $\theta_{(16)}$ satisfies $\theta_{(16)}^T \theta_{(16)} = 0$, we can absorb the factor $f^{-1/2}$ in front of the fermion kinetic term by rescaling $\theta_{(16)}$ via

$$\psi = 2\sqrt{2}f^{-1/4}\theta_{(16)}. \quad (26)$$

In terms of the new $SO(9)$ spinor ψ , the action (25) becomes

$$\mathcal{L}' = p_- \left[\frac{1}{2}v^2 + \frac{i}{2}\psi^T \dot{\psi} + \frac{1}{8}hv^4 + \frac{i}{16}v^2 \partial_i h (\psi^T \gamma^{ij} \psi) v_j + \frac{i}{8}v^2 h \psi^T \dot{\psi} + \dots \right]. \quad (27)$$

In general, the classical BPS solution space described by our metric Eq. (2) has the form of N -copy symmetric product, $S^N(R^9)$, corresponding to the multi-center N M -momentum solutions. The terms of order $O(v^2)$ of Eq. (27), however, has the standard flat space-time normalization regardless of the choice of the harmonic function h . From the matrix theory point of view, it was shown in Ref. [16] that the supersymmetric Yang-Mills quantum mechanics moduli space is flat, even at the non-perturbative level. This behavior from the matrix theory side is thus consistent with the first two terms of the action (27). From Eq. (5) of Ref. [8], we have

$$S_0 = \int dt \left[-1 + \frac{1}{2} \vec{v} \cdot \vec{v} + \frac{15}{16} \frac{(\vec{v} \cdot \vec{v})^2}{r^7} - \frac{105}{16} \frac{(x^i J^{ij} v^j)(\vec{v} \cdot \vec{v})}{r^9} + \dots \right]. \quad (28)$$

We observe that Eq. (28) is the same as Eq. (27), once we choose $h(r) = (15/2)(1/r^7)$ and identify

$$J^{ij} = \frac{i}{2} \psi^T \gamma^{ij} \psi, \quad (29)$$

except for the first constant term in Eq. (28) and the fermion derivative terms in Eq. (27). The spin-orbit term in the effective action (28) was already shown in Ref. [8] to agree with the matrix theory two fermion terms.

In the context of the membrane dynamics in the DLCQ supergravity, the classical eleven-dimensional supergravity calculations capture the non-perturbative instanton corrections of the (2+1)-dimensional supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory [22]. For particle dynamics, however, the eleventh direction is part of the longitudinal space-time of the M -momenta metric (2) in sharp contrast to the membrane case analyzed in Ref. [22]. Thus, the eleven-dimensional supergravity calculation, Eq. (27), produces the same result as the ten-dimensional IIA D-particle calculations, Eq. (28). From the matrix theory point of view, the type IIA calculations and the perturbative matrix quantum mechanics calculations [5]-[11] are not corrected by the non-perturbative effects [16].

The background geometry favored by the DLCQ prescription was shown to possess sixteen Killing spinors. From our approach, it is in principle straightforward to further include the spinning source effects (thus, to compute eight fermion terms from supergravity), even though the actual computations will be considerably involved. We can simply turn on the gravitino fields (by acting the broken supersymmetry transformations

(with the generator χ) on the bosonic background fields, Eq. (2)) and, thereby, the off-diagonal metric elements produced by the spinning source M -momenta, proportional to $J^{ij} = \frac{i}{2}\chi^T\gamma^{ij}\chi$. In other words, we expect that, similar to Ref. [20], the detailed forms of the gravitino and metric fields can be obtained by the supersymmetric variation by the sixteen broken supersymmetry generators. If J_{ij} had the purely bosonic origin, it would be difficult to imagine that only the terms up to J_{ij}^n , where n is finite, show up in the effective action, as the matrix theory analysis shows. Further works along this line are in progress.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sangmin Lee for useful discussions.

References

- [1] T. Banks, W. Fischler, S. H. Shenker, L. Susskind, Phys. Rev. **D 55**, 5112 (1997).
- [2] L. Susskind, hep-th/9704080.
- [3] K. Becker, M. Becker, J. Polchinski, A. Tseytlin, Phys. Rev. **D 56**, 3174 (1997), hep-th/9706072.
- [4] J. Plefka, M. Serone, A. Waldron, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2866 (1998), hep-th/9806081; J. High Energy Phys. 9811, 010 (1998), hep-th/9809080.
- [5] W. Taylor and M. Van Raamsdonk, hep-th/9812239.
- [6] J. A. Harvey, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **68**, 113 (1998), hep-th/9706039.
- [7] J. F. Morales, C. A. Scrucca, and M. Serone, Phys. Lett. **B 417**, 233 (1998), hep-th/9709063; Nucl. Phys. **B 534**, 223 (1998), hep-th/9801183.
- [8] P. Kraus, Phys. Lett. **B 419**, 73 (1998), hep-th/9709199.
- [9] I.N. McArthur, Nucl. Phys. **B 534**, 183 (1998), hep-th/9806082.

- [10] M. Barrio, R. Helling and G. Polhemus, J. High Energy Phys. **05**, 012 (1998), hep-th/9801189.
- [11] J. F. Morales, J. Plefka, C. A. Scrucca, M. Serone, A. Waldron, hep-th/9812039.
- [12] J. Polchinski and P. Pouliot, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 6601 (1997), hep-th/9704029.
- [13] N. Dorey, V. V. Khoze, and M. P. Mattis, Nucl. Phys. **B 502**, 94 (1997), hep-th/9704197.
- [14] S. Hyun, Y. Kiem and H. Shin, Phys. Rev. **D 59**, 021901 (1999), Rapid Comm., hep-th/9808183.
- [15] S. Paban, S. Sethi and M. Stern, hep-th/9808119.
- [16] S. Paban, S. Sethi and M. Stern, Nucl. Phys. **B 534**, 137 (1998), hep-th/9805018.
- [17] S. Hyun, Y. Kiem and H. Shin, Phys. Rev. **D 57**, 4856 (1998), hep-th/9712021.
- [18] S. Hyun, Phys. Lett. **B 441**, 116 (1998), hep-th/9802026
- [19] S. Hyun and Y. Kiem, Phys. Rev. **D 59**, 026003 (1999), hep-th/9805136.
- [20] V. Balasubramanian, D. Kastor, J. Traschen and K.Z. Win, hep-th/9811037.
- [21] B. de Wit, K. Peeters and J. Plefka, Nucl. Phys. **B 532**, 99 (1998), hep-th/9803209.
- [22] S. Hyun, Y. Kiem and H. Shin, hep-th/9901105.